

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/539,603
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2006

Docket No.: L4050.0004

REMARKS

Claims 8 to 16 are pending in this case. Claims 1 -7 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 8 -16 have been added, which are supported by the original specification including the original claims. Applicants hereby respectfully request that the subject application be reconsidered in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Irvin (US Patent No. 6,418,211). Claims 4 -6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Irvin in view of well known feature in the art. The above rejections are respectfully traversed and are moot in view of the above claim amendments.

The claimed invention is directed to a method of calling service among various devices in a home network. Among other features, the claimed invention recites sending a service call request message to a called party and returning a service call response message to a service calling party. In addition, the claimed invention employs a service handle in the process of making service calls.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not demonstrate how Irvin is relevant to the claimed invention. Irvin teaches a call-screening operation. In the cited portion, Irvin teaches capturing the caller ID number of the calling party to determine whether to accept or divert the telephone call (see, col. 4, ll. 45-63). Nowhere in the cited portion of Irvin does it teach sending a service call request message to a called party and returning a service call response message to a service calling party, as does the claimed invention. In contrast, the call-screening operation in Irvin is performed at the end of the called party and the calling party does not take part in the call-screening operation.

U.S. Patent Application No. 10/539,603
Reply to Office Action of September 21, 2006

Docket No.: L4050.0004

Moreover, the cited portion of Irvin does not teach using a service handle to call service, as does the claimed invention. In the claimed invention, the service handle is obtained using characteristic information of the called service or otherwise identifies the called service. In Irvin, the caller ID number identifies the calling party.

In light of the foregoing, new claims 8 to 16 each patentably distinguish over the cited art and are thus believed to be in immediate condition for allowance; such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 20, 2006

By  (40,414)
Hua Gao Reg. No.: 40,414

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant